DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 306 659 EA 020 899

AUTHOR Weisz, Eva
TITLE A View of Curriculum as Opportunities To Learn: An Examination of Curriculum Enactment.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Research; *Classroom Techniques; *Curriculum Evaluation; *Curriculum Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnography

ABSTRACT

This study draws a relationship between curriculum documents and classroom daily occurrences by describing how the curriculum document is enacted in the instructional context. The setting for the study centered on the daily life of two classrooms. Two inductee teachers were paired with mentor teachers as part of a collaborative project between a major university and five local surrounding school districts. Ethnographic domain analysis was used to categorize relationships established by the needs assessment instruments used in the study. The study found the existence of three types of curriculum previously identified in the literature review of the study (overt, hidden, and social), and also identified two more types (masked and unofficial), all of which relate to classroom daily occurrences. The overt curriculum refers to the specific, substantive material teachers convey to students. The hidden curriculum consists of values and norms that schools subtly teach without intending to do so. Social interactions that occur in classrooms between the teacher and students, or between students, comprise the social curriculum. Masked curriculum is identified as academic content that has not been identified previously in the formal state-mandated curriculum. Finally, the unofficial or teacher-constructed curriculum refers to content that is planned by the teacher, but is not part of the planned curriculum document. (JAM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

A VIEW OF CURRICULUM AS OPPORTUNITIES TO LEARN: AN EXAMINATION OF CURRICULUM ENACTMENT

Eva Weisz
Kent State University
404 White Hall
Kent, Ohio 44242

ED3066659

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Eva Weisz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, March, 1989.

EA020899

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"A VIEW OF CURRICULUM AS OPPORTUNITIES TO LEARN:
AN EXAMINATION OF CURRICULUM ENACTMENT"

Introduction

Current national reports, such as A NATION AT RISK (1983), HIGH SCHOOL (1983), and A PLACE CALLED SCHOOL (1984) have called for an upgrading of the curriculum, generally referring to the curriculum documents which drive the district and the school. The assumption underlying these calls is that by improving the document, the district or school will improve the curriculum. Little attention is given to the ways in which these curriculum documents are enacted in classrooms. Thus, there is no clear discussion in these reports about the relationship between curriculum documents and the daily occurrences in classrooms.

One reason for the lack of understanding of the relationship between curriculum documents and classroom practice present in these reports is that rarely has research been conducted in classrooms to explore how the curriculum document is enacted in the instructional context. This study addressed this need. The study examined curriculum enactment as it occurred in two classrooms, and focused on daily classroom life. The major research question was:

> What is the nature of the enacted curriculum in the teachers' classrooms?

It was posited that curriculum enactment is not simply a linear process that begins with the official policy document and moves to teacher plans, and then on through to the classroom level, but that curriculum is what occurs in the daily life of classrooms.

Toward a Definition of the Enacted Curriculum

The label curriculum is often used to refer to various documents which contain objectives, outlines and strategies for teaching course content (Zais, 1976; Beauchamp, 1981; Johnson, 1981). Recently, however, curriculum theorists have raised questions about whether the document is curriculum, and hence what is meant by improving the curriculum. At the forefront of this movement are Jackson (1968), Vallance (1975), Giroux (1979), Eisner (1979), Apple (1981), McCutcheon (1982), Grundy (1987), among others, who suggest that the document is not "the" curriculum, and view curriculum in a more context centered way. For them, curriculum is not a fixed entity, but an active negotiation and construction of knowledge.

In the move toward understanding curriculum as more than document, there are ways to explicate the elements of what that means. In other words, what does it mean to view curriculum as an enacted process?

One way to answer this question is to examine the work of theorists who view curriculum not as a document, but as human interaction. Frymier, Wilhour and Rasp (1973) provide a general framework for examining curriculum as enactment as they state that "a curriculum event includes actors, artifacts and operations..." (p. 92). This builds the notion of viewing

curriculum as what people do in classrooms. Eisner (1979) also proposed a view of curriculum as what people do in classrooms, by exploring what people do, he proposed a series of curriculum types: planned, policy level (overt), unplanned, unintended (hidden) and the null, or the curriculum that is omitted.

McCutcheon (1984) broadened Eisner s definition by suggesting that curriculum, is more than the planned, or the overt curriculum, but what students have an opportunity to learn. She refers to an enacted curriculum which includes elements of the overt and the hidden curriculum. McCutcheon (1984) states that curriculum is concerned with processes used to arrive at the product, and views the two as intertwined in classrooms. She states that "...how one plans affects what people can and may learn, and one's conception of what people should learn or are learning influences one's planning. Hence, curriculum studies entail both products and processes" (p. 1). Thus, McCutcheon sees the need to consider the relationship between what is planned and what is enacted.

Recent scholars have extended the view of curriculum as enacted by linking curriculum and instruction. These scholars view the two as tightly intertwined, and posit that what goes on in the daily life in classrooms become the "opportunities" in McCutcheon s definition. May (1985) states that "curriculum is the dynamic, communicative interaction between a teacher,

students and subject matter within a particular educational setting" (p. 13). Zumwalt (1986) states that the curriculum and instruction issues appear intertwined, and therefore the distinction between curriculum and instruction is blurred. King (1986) identifies curriculum as an event in a classroom setting. Weade (1987) argues for a merger of the concepts of curriculum and instruction, presenting a circular instead of a linear relationship between the two. She states that there is a relationship, but that the point at which curriculum and instruction merge is unclear. These scholars argue that in face to face interactions in classrooms, one may identify the opportunities to learn, and thus what becomes the curriculum. Therefore, the process and the product become intertwined.

Of the general conceptions of curriculum enactment presented in the literature, McCutcheon's is one of the most inclusive and was used for the purposes of this study. McCutcheon (1982) statest that curriculum is "What students have an opportunity to learn in school, through both the hidden and overt curriculum, and what they do not have the opportunity to learn because certain matters were not included in the curriculum" (p. 9). If this definition is adopted, then curriculum is a question in search of an answer in the classroom context. Thus, the question of what is the curriculum can be restated as: What do students have an opportunity to learn in this particular classroom?

Adoption of this definition provided a framework to explicate the elements of curriculum that were observable in the classroom.

In order to make visible what students have an opportunity to learn, that is, to study curriculum in practice, it becomes necessary to examine what types of curriculum have been identified. Review of the literature showed that there is no single definition of enacted curriculum; enacted curriculum is not a unitary entity. Instead, what is enacted in classrooms has been defined in several ways, i.e., the overt, hidden, social curriculum. The following three types of curriculum have been identified within the enacted curriculum in the classrooms from the literature:

> Overt curriculum: the specific, academic material which teachers intend to convey to students, sometimes through activities that are referred to as lessons. For example, reading groups convey overt curriculum (Eisner, 1979).
>
> Hidden curriculum: the values and norms that schools teach in subtle ways without necessarily intending to do so. For example, punctuality is a hidden curriculum often conveyed by schools (Eisner, 1979).
>
> Social curriculum: the social interactions and norms that occur in classrooms, and thus provide a message to students. For example, teacher warmth conveys a message to students (Erickson, 1982).

However, in examining everyday life in the classrooms, the opportunities to learn, and the content of tasks within those opportunities in the current study, two additional types of

curriculum were identified which have not accounted for previous curriculum research. These contribute to further clarification of the different types of curriculum enactment. The two types of curriculum identified during the present study were:

> Unofficial curriculum: teacher constructed curriculum, or academic activities which are conveyed by teachers but are not part of the formal policy document. This is also a type of overt curriculum. A poetry lesson which is not included in the official policy document is an example of unofficial curriculum.
>
> Masked curriculum: a curriculum that conveys academic content that is intended by the teacher, but often in ways other than the traditional lesson; often procedural management activities and informal activities "masquerade" as the vehicles for carrying academic content. Students may or may not know that academic content is being conveyed. For example, Lunch Count may convey Math curriculum.

Thus, the above five types of curricula can be categorized under the label, the enacted curriculum. Each of these were used in the study to explore what students had an opportunity to learn.

Conceptions of Curriculum

Since this was a study of curriculum, the literature on conceptions of curriculum was pertinent to help more clearly define curriculum in a broader sense, as it occurs in classrooms. The literature reviewed consisted for the most part of various philosophical perspectives taken by those who study the field, since little empirical research has been conducted on curriculum

in classrooms with teachers. As Walker (1981) states, "We in the field of curriculum have failed to conduct the empirical research needed to clarify the nature of the phenomena and problems we address" (p. 282). This paucity of curriculum research is due, in part, by confusion in the field about the use of the term "curriculum," as well as the failure in the field to view curriculum as anything but apart from instruction.

One conception of curriculum which emerged in the early 1900's and is still prevalent today is a view of curriculum as a technological system of production. One of the early proponents of such a view was Bobbitt (1918). Johnson (1967) also assigns a linear view to curriculum and views it as the output of one system (curriculum system) and an input into another system (instructional system). Gagne (1967) also embraces this view and contends that curriculum is a "sequence of units arranged in such a way that the learning of each unit may be accomplished as a single act, provided the capabilities described by specified prior units have already been mastered by the learner" (p. 23).

Other traditional, rationalistic views conceived of curriculum in a narrow sense, often limiting it to a specific document or program of studies. Such subject-centered views, as exemplified by Hutchins (1936) and Bestor (1956), reflect the notion that any curriculum have to include the "greats" in terms of the organized body of knowledge that have been accumulated in the world.

Yet another view was that of the curriculum as a vehicle for transferring the experiences of the race to the next generation. One aspect of this view was exemplified by Smith, Stanley and Shores' (1957) definition of curriculum as "A sequence of potential experiences set up in the school for the purpose of disciplining children and youth in group ways of thinking and acting" (p. 3). Dewey (1902) served as one of the proponents of a child-centered curriculum, and stated, "Abandon the notion of subject matter as something hard and fast...and we realize that the child and the curriculum are simply two limits which define a single process. Just as two points define a straight line" (p. 11). Caswell and Campbell (1935) also do not limit the curriculum to a formal document or course of study, but conceptualize it in broader terms. They state that curriculum is "...composed of all the experiences children have under the guidance of teachers" (p. 66).

During the 1960's and 70's, the notion of curriculum as an instructional plan emerged, suggesting that curriculum is a form of a plan for meeting objectives and goals. Taba (1962) states that "A curriculum is a plan for learning" (p. 214). Popham and Baker (1970) also view curriculum as a plan, and state that it is "all planned learning outcomes for which the school is responsible..." (p. 48). Saylor and Alexander (1974) state that curriculum is "A plan for providing sets of learning

opportunities to achieve broad goals and related specific outcomes for an identifiable population served by a single school center" (p. 6).

Each of the conceptions of curriculum described above was problematic in terms of this study because limiting the curriculum to course lists and subject matter designations reveals little about actual classroom occurrences, and the ways in which experiences are provided for students. There is a current trend in the field to move toward reconceptualizing curriculum in a broader sense. These views hold that the curriculum is not merely a document, but is comprised of many elements which form the whole curricular process. Eisner (1979) defines curriculum as "a series of planned events that are intended to have educational consequences for one or more students" (p. 39). This definition implies that more than one event occurs and that there is an aim or purpose of the curriculum which is educational. Yet by the use of the term "consequences," Eisner allows for the existence of results or products that may be unintended. McCutcheon (1982) views curriculum as both product and process, and argues for the broad definition that curriculum is "what students have an opportunity to learn in an educational setting, through both the hidden and overt curriculum, and what they do not have an opportunity to learn because certain matters were not included in the

curriculum" (p. 2). McCutcheon (1988) views curriculum and teaching as entwined and states that "...curriculum affects and is affected by teaching, and the opposite is also true. So, the medium and the message have a close relationship rather than being neatly separable" (p. 1). Weade (1987) raises questions about the relationship between curriculum and instruction, and presents a model for merging the two concepts in a cyclical, continuous relationship, which she labels "curriculum 'n instruction" (p. 17).

King (1986) comes closest to forwarding the conception of curriculum that undergrids this study. She presents the thesis that "Curriculum is a situated event" (p. 36), and proceeds to state "When curriculum is viewed as an event, its essence cannot be captured in or equated with a lesson plan or a curriculum guide. Rather, the curriculum is what happens when the lesson plan becomes the basis for a classroom activity. The interactions of classroom participants with the material environment, skills, and ideas, and each other are all aspects of what comes to be labeled the curriculum" (p. 36).

Literature on Beginning Teachers

A second literature base that was relevant to the research was the literature on beginning teachers, teacher induction and teacher mentoring, since the two teachers observed were inductee teachers who were participants in an Induction Program. The tone

of the literature on beginning teachers is not pleasant. Howey, Matthes and Zimpher (1985) state, "...new teachers arrive in classrooms ill equipped to handle the regular duties of teaching and the concomitant reality shock of the first year of teaching" (p. 61). Ryan (1987) offers vivid accounts of the first years of teaching, depicting a wide range of concerns, problems and issues at this point in career development. McLaren (1970) states, "Most beginning teachers can often do little more than struggle through their new world of pupil personalities and unfamiliar subject matter" (p. 64). Gere (1980) also reinforces this same notion as he states, "The new teacher, trained in pools, doesn't even know how to survive, much less ride the waves" (p. 88).

One of the major areas of concern for beginning teachers is curricular planning and instructional knowledge. Blase and Greenfield (1982) found areas of concern for beginning teachers were knowledge of subject matter and how to teach it, managerial tasks, daily planning, and knowledge of teaching. Zeichner and Tabachnick (1985) found eighteen dilemmas common to the beginning teachers studied which fell into four categories: teacher knowledge and the curriculum, teacher's role, teacher-pupil relationships, and student diversity.

Recommendations for programs which support beginning teachers are rampant in the literature. Housten and Felder (1982) surmise that "New teachers must be inducted into the

profession humanely, in ways that engender pride, openness and increased professional competence and stature" (p. 450). From their extensive study of first year teachers, Grant and Zeichner (1981) recommend personalized and individualized induction programs, geared to the needs of specific beginning teachers. Due to this state of affairs, the literature documents many Induction Programs currently in existence to support beginning teachers (Burke and Schmidt, 1984; Shalaway, 1985; Howey, Matthes and Zimpher, 1985).

Literature on Teacher Planning

A third body of literature which impacted on this study is the literature on teacher planning. Although research about the process of curriculum planning is scarce, a few significant studies about it have been conducted. There is a general consensus in the literature that planning is preparation that teachers make for teaching, and can include a wide variety of activities. Although Tyler (1949) presented a linear model of curriculum planning, more recent research on teacher planning has shown that teachers generally do not follow this type of model, but go about planning in a less systematic manner. Borko and Shavelson (1983) state, "The prescriptive model is consistently not used in teachers' planning in schools" (p. 218). Zahorik (1975) also echoes this view that behavioral objectives do not seem to be an important component of teacher planning. Yinger

(1977) found that "...each planning event draws from prior planning and teaching experiences and that each teacher event feeds future planning and teaching processes" (p. 11). The literature also states that beginning teachers, in particular, have difficulties with planning and implementing instruction (Pajak and Blase, 1982; Clark and Peterson, 1985; Davis and Zaret, 1984).

Research and Design and Methodology

The general research approach for this study was descriptive qualitative research in the tradition of Guba and Lincoln (1985) and Bogdan and Biklen (1982). This perspective was chosen because sustained, systematic observation had to be undertaken in order to determine how the two teachers' plans and decisions got "acted out" in the classroom. This research methodology permitted systematic documentation of the opportunities that students had to learn. A second reason qualitative methodology was appropriate for this study was that in order to analyze factors that impacted on the enacted curriculum, it was necessary to be able to move across different types of data. Third, qualitative methodology permitted the researcher to gain access to the perspectives of the two teachers about planning through in-depth interview.

The population for this study was inductee teachers who were each paired with mentor teachers in a collaborative project between a major university and five local surrounding school districts. The study was conducted during the first year of a three year project. One district was selected from the five districts which were participating in the project for the purposes of this study. In particular, two inductee teachers and their mentors were selected from two of the schools within that district for case study.

This project was chosen as the population for this study because it provided a unique opportunity for studying inductee teachers. Since the project had set up reflectivity as a basis for the examination of teaching, the research conducted here already had teachers who were willing to be reflective and collaborate with the researcher. The study was undertaken in the classrooms of two inductee teachers because there is a need for research about the curriculum concerns of inductee teachers and how they transform policy documents and plans into practice. Studies of curriculum planning have not focused on inductee teachers, yet these teachers must deal with new policy documents and curricular procedures.

In particular, the two teachers studied, one a first grade teacher and the other a DH teacher, were inductee teachers, not beginning teachers, since one teacher had tutored several years

prior, while the other teacher was newly out of a teacher preparation program. Both were transition teachers. This type of an inductee teacher was chosen because although the research focus heretofore in the literature has been on those teachers just out of teacher preparation programs, there is a new, growing group of teachers which includes not only those teachers, but also teachers who are beginning a new phase. A Needs Assessment Instrument administered to participants in this Induction Program showed that the pattern of concerns was the same across beginning teachers and inductee teachers.

The researcher was in the field site for three and a half months, five days each week, three hours each day, and conducted systemmatic data gathering for each teacher. Data were collected in the form of fieldnotes, audio transcripts, lesson plans, policy documents, interview responses, students' work and curricular resources.

Since one focus of the study was the relationship between the policy document and the enacted curriculum and the teachers' planned document and the enacted curriculum, each of these had to be laid out and examined in order to search for patterns in them. Therefore, the basic data analysis technique for this study was a type of ethnographic analysis termed "domain analysis." In domain analysis, the data are searched for kinds of categories using semantic relationships as tools by which to derive

consistencies and patterns in the data. The semantic relationship used was strict inclusion (X is a kind of Y), in order to get at the parts, or elements, which comprised the total day, and thus, the curriculum. Data were organized by noting instances, or subcategories, for each category or activity. Next, the fieldnotes were collapsed to include the following for each activity during the day: time, where, who, curricular content, activity description, and data source. This provided a detailed breakdown of the activities for each day that was observed, and facilitated examining the activities across time in order to determine the frequency of activities, the pattern of the day, and the variability/consistency across days. This helped to define a "typical" day, which yielded information about what students were exposed to, and thus defined the enacted curriculum in the two classrooms. This enacted curriculum was then compared with the policy document and the teachers' planned curricular document to determine the relationships between them.

Findings of the Study

The study found the existence of the three types of curriculum previously identified, and also identified two additional types. The first three types of curriculum which were already identified in the literature were the overt curriculum (Jackson, 1968; Eisner, 1979; Bussis, Chittenden, Amarel, 1976), the hidden curriculum (Dreeban, 1968, 1973; Sarason, 1971;

Anyon, 1980, 1981; Giroux, 1983; Kanpol, 1987) and the social curriculum (Wallat and Green, 1979; Gilmore and Glatthorn, 1981; Erickson, 1982). The two additional types of curriculum identified which had not been identified previously were the masked curriculum and the unofficial curriculum.

Overt curriculum refers to the specific, substantitve material which teachers intend to convey to students. It is overt because it is the intended fare that schools are generally expected to teach, usually in the form of a lesson or an activity. The overt curriculum often exists in official curriculum documents which teachers are given by their school districts to follow, and in their subsequent lesson plans. Examples of overt curriculum in the classrooms were Language Arts, Reading, Math, Spelling, Folder Work, Read and Do, Workshop activity, and Phonics. Exploration of the teachers' policy documents and planned documents showed that the overt curriculum was driven by these prescribed documents, and what was left to teacher discretion was which skills would be taught frm an entire set of skills. The nature of the overt curriculum was also impacted on by the teachers' philosophies about teaching and learning; in both classrooms, the overt curriculum became reduced to a set of "doings" and activities.

The study also supported the existence of a hidden curriculum in both classrooms. Such hidden curriculum consists

of values and norms that schools teach in subtle ways without necessarily intending to do so, and may be thought of as a by-product of schooling. This type of curriculum is termed "hidden" because it is often very subtle and difficult to identify and assess. For example, a teacher may be teaching conformity to students by discouraging any variation from prescribed daily routines. Jackson (1968) refers to the hidden curriculum as the "secondary consequences" of schooling, while Giroux (1983) states the hidden curriculum is transmitted to teachers through the underlying rules that structure the routines and social relationships in schools. Hidden curriculum was conveyed daily in both classrooms through activities such as the Pledge of Allegiance (patriotism), Superstars (merits of the work ethic), and Lining Up (conformity, routines).

The third type of curriculum evidenced was the social curriculum as discussed by Erickson (1982), Wallat and Green (1979), Green and Harker (1982), and Gilmore and Glatthorn (1981). Such social curriculum consists of the social interactions and norms that occur in classrooms, between either teacher and students, or between students, and suggests that social interactions and structures are a part of task, and thus a part of curriculum. Social curriculum was conveyed in the two classrooms via teacher compliments to individual students, teacher compliments to the whole class, and teacher questions about students' personal problems and lives.

A masked curriculum was identified in both classrooms which conveyed academic content, which has not been identified previously in research on curriculum. Such masked curriculum conveyed academic content while "masquerading" as a procedural/management or informal activity. For example, collecting lunch money during Lunch Count was a type of masked curriculum, because even though the activity appeared to be that of collecting money, students were also participating in a lesson in Math. The academic focus may or may not be intended by the teacher when conveying masked curriculum. Thus, the term "masked" is used to refer to this type of curriculum because students may or may not perceive the substantive information which is conveyed.

Finally, the study supported the existence of an unofficial curriculum, or teacher-constructed curriculum. Unofficial curriculum refers to the academic content which is not a part of the official policy document but is conveyed in classrooms. Such content is generally intended (planned) by the teacher, but is not necessarily a part of the planned document. In other words, unofficial curriculum may also be a spontaneous (unintended) lesson, or activity, that a teacher has students engage in that is not included in the official policy document or even in the lesson plan. Unofficial curriculum was conveyed in the classrooms via a science lesson, discussions about vandalism, and a "hands-on" writing activity, among others.

Discussion of Findings

The Overt Curriculum

The overt curriculum, or the specific, academic material which teachers intended to convey to students and did convey to students, was driven by teacher plans and official policy documents. In the DH teachers' classroom, the overt curriculum consisted of Language Arts, Reading, Math, Spelling and Folder Work. During Language Arts, students studied letters of the alphabet via varied activities which were generally driven by worksheets. Thus, what was labeled Language Arts was in reality the alphabet, or one small aspect of Language Arts. Overt curriculum was conveyed in the two Reading Groups via practicing reading phrases and sentences aloud and answering questions orally or on paper about what was read. Therefore, Reading was predominantly oral reading and comprehension skills. Math consisted of activities with worksheets which pertained to one and two digit addition and sequencing and recognition of numbers. The overt curriculum for Spelling consisted of four weekly spelling words given to the students, and the practicing of writing, saying and illustrating of these words in preparation for Friday tests on them. Finally, overt curriculum was conveyed during [illegible] work, which was daily seatwork which was comprised of worksheets which reinforced Math, Language Arts, Writing and fine motor skills.

Exploration of policy documents and plans suggested that several factors contributed to what became the overt curriculum in the classrooms. First, the content areas conveyed in class were the same content areas listed in the students' official policy documents, or IEP's. Thus, the DH teacher was following the prescribed official policy document. Beyond this, the areas of Language Arts, Reading, Spelling and Math are considered "basic skills" for seven to nine year olds. What was left to teacher discretion was which basic skills would be taught from the entire set of skills. The selection of a limited set had consequences for students in terms of what they had opportunities to learn. While the teacher stated that the skills she selected were the ones that the students could do, the question still must be raised about those not presented. Another question becomes: When will students have the opportunity to acquire the more complex skills and processes? For example, if they are never provided opportunities to write extended text, how will they learn to write? How does teaching the alphabet build the basis for reading and writing? Questions such as these need to be examined with teachers and the cumulative effects of limiting the elements of the overt curriculum need to be considered.

Many of the same questions can be raised for the first grade teacher, even though the overt curriculum in her classroom had a wider range. There were seven major categories which conveyed

overt curriculum in the first grade teacher's classroom: Varied Activities, Workshop Activity, Read and Do, Reading Groups, Phonics, Spelling and Math. A wide variety of overt curriculum was conveyed during Varied Activities. For example, writing cards and letters conveyed handwriting and penmanship skills, among others, while the lesson on plants conveyed information about the parts of a plant and plant survival. The overt curriculum conveyed during the Workshop Activity reinforced Language Arts, Math and Phonics via worksheets the students completed. The case was similar during the Read and Do activity: students were engaged in work related to Math and Language Arts. The overt curriculum conveyed during the Reading Groups was oral reading skills and comprehension skills. During Phonics, the activities in the workbook conveyed content about blends, suffixes, vowels and consonants, while Spelling consisted of words recongition, using words in sentences aloud and spelling words correctly. Finally, the overt curriculum of Math was addition and substraction of one and two digit numbers.

Exploration of the policy document and the planned document showed that a contributing factor to the nature of the overt curriculum in the first grade teacher's classroom was the nature of the official policy document. This Course of Study contained the same content areas as the teacher's overt curriculum. There were also the same content areas and skills prescribed for first

grade students. Another factor impacting on the nature of the overt curriculum in the first grade classroom was the teacher's philosophy about teaching and learning, since the series of worksheets comprised almost an assembly line type of place. This suggested the metaphor of the classroom as a workplace (Marshall, 1988). The series of "doings" may also have been related to maintaining discipline, with the notion that if students were kept busy, there would be fewer discipline problems.

The contrast of the overt curriculum of both classrooms suggests that the range of opportunities and types of activities differed, given the policy document of the first grade teacher which identified a broad range and the policy document of the DH teacher which identified a narrower range. Also, the DH teacher had only the previous teacher's plan to build on and to guide her choices, while the first grade teacher had more expansive documents which laid out a wide range of opportunities. The impact of the type of policy document on teacher planning and enactment needs to be examined. The question of the types of activities of the overt curriculum cannot be determined by this study but it is for future curricularists to argue. In both classrooms in this study, the opportunities were constrained by the documents and teacher views of students as well as the need for an orderly environment.

The Masked Curriculum

A masked curriculum was identified in both classrooms which conveyed content, which has not been identified previously in research on curriculum. Such masked curriculum conveyed academic content while "masquerading" as an Informal Academic Focused Activity, and may be intended or unintended by the teacher.

In the DH classroom, the existence of a masked curriculum was evidenced during several activities. For example, Lunch Count served as vehicle to convey Math to students, while masked curriculum during Arrival Time dealt with snow, St. Patrick's Day and reading. During the Language Arts lesson, fine motor skills were reinforced via activities related to letters of the alphabet, and there was a discussion about George Washington because his picture appeared on a worksheet. Masked curriculum was also conveyed during the Sharing activity, as students listened to the teacher and their peers discuss people, places and things. Finally, counting, etiquette and dexterity were conveyed during the Snack activity.

The DH teacher stated that she intended to convey academic content during Informal Academic Focused Activities, so that she was very much aware of the existence of a masked curriculum. She believed that students were motivated to listen and participate during activities which were not blatantly academic focused.

Thus, the DH teacher had an intent to focus on substantive content even though she may not have been conveying it through a traditional lesson.

There was also evidence of a masked curriculum in the first grade teacher's classroom. Math skills were reinforced during Lunch Count, while the students exchanged information about objects and pets during Sharing. During Lining Up to leave the classroom, students practiced the alphabet by calling out each other's initials for lining us. Masked curriculum was also conveyed during Indoor Recess as students practiced reading, writing and drawing through activities disguised as games.

The identification of masked curriculum in both classrooms is a finding which adds a new dimension to prior knowledge about the nature of curriculum in classrooms. For these two teachers, Informal Academic Focused Activities conveyed academic content so that the Academic Focused Activities were not the only activities through which students had an opportunity to engage in academic content. Since this masked curriculum is disguised in the form of an Informal Academic Activity, it is not stated in lesson plans and must be observed in situ. This may make it diffucult to " get at" in terms of its existence, as well as to determine what extent it is conveyed to students. Teachers and administrators need to be trained about the masked curriculum to examine the purpose it serves. Whether or not this type of

curriculum serves its purpose and is effective needs to be examined also. The high percentage of the Informal Academic Focused Activities in these two classrooms suggests that this curriculum takes time away from students to engage in Academic Focused Activities, thus further suggesting the need to consider its contribution to student learning.

The Hidden Curriculum

Students also had an opportunity to learn in both classrooms via a hidden curriculum. Hidden curriculum is conveyed by teachers as they teach norms, values and attitudes in subtle ways without necessarily intending to do so, and may be thought of as a "by-produce" of schooling. It is generally transmitted through everyday occurrences in schools and is the non-academic outcome of schooling. Jackson (1986) refers to the hidden curriculum as the "secondary consequences" of schooling, while Giroux (1983) states the hidden curriculum is transmitted to students through the underlying rules that structure the routines and social relationships in schools.

In the DH classroom, hidden curriculum was conveyed daily through activities such as the Pledge of Allegiance (patriotism), Superstars (merits of the work ethic), and Lining uP (conformity). Much of the hidden curriculum conveyed stemmed from the types of activity structures that the teacher had set up in the classroom. For example, Procedural/Management Activities

often conveyed compliance by their mere routine nature. Other hidden curriculum, such as teacher openness with students, grew out of what the teacher said and the ways she related to the class.

Hidden curriculum was also conveyed in the first grade classrom via activities and teacher behaviors. For example, the teacher's frequent movement of furniture and acceptance of noise conveyed that the world is not always a stable and quiet place. Her encouraging problem-solving and risk-taking conveyed an atmosphere of cooperation and safety among students. The first grade teacher's personal theory was a factor which impacted on the hidden curriculum. She believed that students learn best in a non-threatening atmosphere, and that students should be encouraged to ask questions and make mistakes. This climate undergirded and accounted for some of the hidden curriculum that was conveyed. The hidden curriculum of routines and stability may be accounted for by the way the teacher structured the way time was spent and activities carried out.

Teachers must understand that they do teach norms and behaviors and that hidden curriculum is often conveyed in subtle ways. It is difficult to identify and assess, but it is very powerful. If the hidden curriculum that schools teach mirrors the larger society, then it is imperative that teachers have an awareness of it so that they may make sound judgements about what is conveyed through it to students.

The Social Curriculum

The social curriculum also played a significant role in conveying information to students and defining the nature of life in the two classrooms. It is a type of curriculum through which social interactions and norms are conveyed. Such social curriculum has been identified in the instruction field and the work on ethnography in classrooms (Erickson, 1982, as cited in Green, 1983), and suggests that social interactions and structures are part of task, and thus a part of curriculum. There was evidence of a social curriculum carried by the interactions between teacher and students as well as students with one another in both classrooms, in peer culture activities (e.g., playground, note passing, etc.).

In the DH classroom, the social curriculum was conveyed via teacher compliments to individual students, teacher compliments to the whole class, teacher thank-you's to the whole class, the use of students' names and teacher questions about students' personal problems and events.

Factors contributing to the existence of a social curriculum in the DH classroom were teacher beliefs about classrooms and the nature of teaching and learning. The DH teacher stated that she believed that social interactions with students can partially impact on learning, as well as developing a positive environment in the classroom. Another factor that contributed to the social

curriculum was the DH teacher's way of interacting with students. She spoke individually to students during lessons, paused to help them out during lessons, etc. A third factor accounting for the existence of social curriculum in the classroom was the activity structure in which the social curriculum in the classroom was embedded. For instance, students often worked alone at their desks for chunks of time. The students had little opportunity to work collaboratively with each other. The interactions were primarily between teacher and individuals working alone or in groups.

There was also evidence of a daily social curriculum in the first grade teacher's classroom. She greeted students by name in the morning, used students' names often, interacted with students individually, and discussed personal matters with students.

Again, the first grade teacher's personal beliefs about how students learn best and what comprises an effective classroom environment were reflected in the type of social curriculum that existed in her classroom. The first grade teacher created a social climate in which the social curriculum was embedded that involved teacher-student interactions. As with the DH teacher, the types of interactions were primarily teacher directed.

As was the case with hidden curriculum, teachers need to understand the existence and nature of the social curriculum, and the way that it impacts on the dynamics of classroom life, and

ultimately, on student learning. They must realize that the social curriculum is embedded in task, and task is a part of curriculum. The more complex question becomes: How does social curriculum impact on student learning? In these two classrooms, the general climate was positive, and the classroom was a quiet, well-managed place to work. For both teachers, the climate reflected a "work" orientation. That is, through their interactions, the teachers and students quietly got "work" done. Thus, consideration of what was accomplished in the social curriculum led to the identification of a work ethic in which students did their own work and received individual and group rewards (compliments). Thus, the cumulative effect of the social curriculum produces a value orientation which can be thought of as part of the hidden curriculum.

The Unofficial Curriculum

There was also evidence of an unofficial, or teacher constructed curriculum in both classrooms. This curriculum is termed "unofficial" because it is not a part of the official policy document, and may be intended (planned) or unintended (spontaneous).

In the DH classroom, the reading and discussion of the "Bug" poem on the wall constituted one example of unofficial curriculum. Another example was the activity during which the teacher cut an orange in half and the students examined, smelled,

tasted and touched it, and then wrote about it. Thus, the teacher involved students in a Language Arts activity but did not designate it as such. As suggested previously, what "counted" officially as Language Arts was the alphabet. Thus, what the students knew as Language Arts were not inclusive of all of the activities that occurred within the realm of Language Arts in the classroom. This raises questions about how labels in classrooms about subjects (e.g., Language Arts, Math) influence what students perceive as "subject matter."

Unofficial curriculum was conveyed in the first grade classroom during fifteen of the thirty days observed. For example, unofficial curriculum was conveyed via a science lesson, an instance of reading and discussion of Weekly Reader, and discussions about vandalism and smoking. These activities were unofficial since they were not regular aspects of the daily routine and were not listed in the plans for the day. The activities were "special" events.

Since there was such a great amount of unofficial curriculum in the first grade teacher's classroom, it might be assumed that the teacher's planning was such that it permitted time for unofficial curriculum to take place. It might also be conjectured that the teacher believed that topics and skills conveyed in the unofficial curriculum were important, despite the fact that they were not a part of the official policy document.

Future work needs to consider how such "special" activities contribute to student learning and students' perceptions of what is important to know.

Since both the DH teacher and the first grade teacher conveyed unofficial curriculum, questions must be raised about the nature of official policy documents. Do policy documents include all the content that is conveyed in classrooms? As indicated in these two instances, they did not. These two teachers included content not included in their policy documents, and exercised their freedom to do so. This curriculum planning had both deliberate and spontaneous elements. Further work needs to consider the impact on student learning of the teacher constructed elements of the curriculum. Are these merely "special" events or central parts of their learning environment? How teachers and students perceive such events must also be explored.

Implications and Conclusions

The identification of five different types of curriculum in both classrooms, regardless of the type of classroom or grade level, has major implications for the field of curriculum. This finding suggests that curriculum cannot be conceived as a total unitity, but that it is comprised of elements which need to be considered when examining it. When studying curriculum in classrooms, these elements must be taken into account in order to

determine what students have an opportunity to learn. This is a departure from past thinking, which only legitimized substantive matters as components of curriculum.

The question of which type of curriculum is most important or valuable to students may be raised, but perhaps this is a naive question. The five types of curriculum identified cannot be isolated from one another, but comprise a system of curriculum. It is dangerous to separate them out because they each impact on what students have an opportunity to engage in. The masked, hidden, social and unofficial curriculum each layessential groundwork for conveying academic, or overt curriculum.

The identification of a masked content curriculum is a finding which adds a new dimension to prior knowledge about curriculum. This findings raises questions about the nature of activities in classrooms which carry masked curriculum and the area of non-academic time in general. The obvious question that may be raised is: Do these activities really convey academic content? There is a need for further research into masked curriculum in order to attempt to answer this question.

The study shows that the curriculum as document definition is not adequate, and curriculum must be studied not only in terms of the plan, but in situ. In order to determine the facets that drive the curriculum and thus impinge on what students have an

opportunity to earn, it becomes necessary to examine to moment-by-moment processes and interactions in classrooms. Through examining the face-to-face interactions and processes in classrooms, it becomes possible to see how meanings are constructed and in turn, what students learn within the opportunities provided. Ultimately, this helps in better understanding the definition forwarded by McCutcheon, curriculum as what students have an opportunity to learn.

Bibliography

Anyon, J. Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. Journal of Education, 1980, 1.

Anyon, J. Social class and school knowledge. Curriculum Inquiry, 1981, 1.

Apple, M. W. On analyzing hegemony. In Giroux, H. A., Penna, A. N. & Pinar, W. F., ed. Curriculum and Instruction, Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1981.

Beauchamp, G. Basic components of a curriculu theory. In Giroux, H. A., Penna, A. N. and Pinar, W. F., eds. Curriculum and Instruction, Berkley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1981.

Bestor, A. The restoration of learning. New York, NY: Knopf, 1956.

Blase, J. J. and Greenfield, W. On the meaning of being a high school teacher: The beginning years. The High School Journal, 1982, 65, 263-270.

Bobbitt, F. The curriculum. Boston: Houghton, 1918.

Bogdan, R. and Biklen, S. Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1982.

Borko, H. and Shavelson, R. J. Speculations on teacher education: Recommendtions from research to teachers' cognitions. Journal of Education for Teaching, 1983, 9, 210-224.

Boyer, E. L. High School. New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1983.

Burke, P. and Schmidt, W. Entry year assistance: A promising practice. Action in Teacher Education, 1984, 4, 30-34.

Bussis, A. M., Chittenden, E. A., and Amarel, M. Beyond surface curriculum. Westview Press, 1976.

Caswell, H. L. and Campbell, D. A. Curriculum development. New York: American Book, 1935.

Clark, C. M. and Peterson, P. L. Handbook of research on teaching. New York: Macmillan, 1985.

Davis, M. D. and Zaret, E. Needed in teacher education: A developmental model for evaluation of teacher, pre-service to in-service. Journal of Teacher Education, 1984, 35, 18-22.

Dewey, J. The child and the curriculum. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1902.

Dreeben, R. On what is learned in schools. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

Dreeben, R. The schools as a workplace. In Ballantine, J. H., ed. Schools and society. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishers, 1973.

Eisner, E. The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school program. New York: Macmillan, 1979.

Erickson, F. Classroom discourse as improvisation: Relationships between academic task structure and social participation structure in lessons. In Wilkinson, L.C., ed. Communicating in the Classroom. London, England: Academic Press, Inc., 1912.

Frymier, J. R., Wilhour, J. and Rasp, A. Curriculum. In Frymier, J. R., ed. A school for tomorrow. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corp, 1973.

Gagne, R. M. Curriculum research and the promotion of learning. In Tyler, R. W., Gagne, R. M. and Scriven, M. (eds.), Perspectives of curriculum evaluation. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967.

Gere, A. R. Practice into theory. The English Journal, 1980, 69, 87-89.

Gilmore, P. and Glatthorn, A. Ethnography and education: Children in and out of school. Language and ethnography series. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1981.

Giroux, H. A. Theory and resistance in education: A pedagogy for the opposition. Boston, MA: Begin and Garvey Publishers, Inc., 1983.

Giroux, H. A. Toward a new sociology of curriculum. Educational Leadership, 1979, 37, 3, 248-253.

Goodlad, J. I. A place called school. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1984.

Grant, C. A. and Zeichner, K. M. In-service support for first year teachers: The state of the scene. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1981, 14, 99-111.

Green, J. L. and Harker, J. O. Gaining access to learning: Conversational, social and cognitive demands of group participation. In Wilkinson, L. C., ed. Communicating in classrooms. New York, NY: Academic Press, 1982.

Grundy, G. G. Curriculum: Product or praxis. Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press, 1987.

Guba, E. and Lincoln, Y. Effective evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Housten, W. R. and Felder, B. Break horses, not teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 1981, 63, 457-460.

Howey, K., Matthes, W. and Zimpher, N. Issues and problems in professional development: A review of selected literature pertaining to the recruitment, initial, inductive and in-service education of teachers. Paper prepared for the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, Chicago, 1985.

Hutchins, R. M. The higher learning in America. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1936.

Jackson, P. Life in classrooms. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.

Johnson, M., Jr. Definitions and models in curriculum theory. Educational Theory, 1967, 17, 127.

Kanpol, B. The role of teachers in the social order. Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1987.

King. N. R. Reconceptualizing the curriculum. Theory Into Practice, 1986, 25, 36-40.

May, W. What art means to third and fourth graders: A two year case study. (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1985.)

McCutcheon, G. What in the world is curriculum theory. Theory Into Practice, 1982, 21, 18-22.

McCutcheon, G. Curriculum and the work of teachers. In Apple, M. and Beyer, L. (eds.), The curriculum: Problems, Politics and Possibilities, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1988.

McLaren, M. B. First year teacher? Try instructional objectives. Audiovisual Instruction, 1970, 15, 64-66.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. A Nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform, 1983.

Pajak, E. F. and Blase, J. J. Teaching, the loss of innocence, and the psychological development of a professional self. Educational Horizons, 1982, 60, 65-72.

Popham, W. J. and Baker, E. I. Systemmatic Instruction, Englewood Cliffs, NY: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Ryan, K. Surviving is not good enough: Overcoming the problems of beginning teachers. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Sarason, S. The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Saylor, J. G. and Alexander, W. M. Planning curriculum for schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Shalaway, L. Beginning teachers...sink or swim. Mid-Continental Regional Educational Laboratory, Aurora, Colorado, 1985.

Smith, B. O., Stanley, W. O. & Shores, J. H. Fundamentals of curriculum development. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1957.

Taba, H. Curriculum development: Theory and practice. New York: Harcourt, 1962.

Tyler, R. W. Basic principle of curriculum and instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.

Vallance, E. Aesthetic criticism and curriculum description. (Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1975.)

Walker, D. F. What curriculum research? In Giroux, H. A., Penna, A. N., and Pinar, W. F. (eds.), Curriculum and instruction. Berkley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1981.

Wallat, C. & Green, J. L. Social rules and communicative contexts in kindergarten. Theory Into Practice, 1979, 4, 275-284.

Weade, R. Curriculum 'n instruction: The construction of meaning. Theory Into Practice, 1987, 15-25.

Weisz, E. An examination of curriculum as opportunities to learn: A double case study. (Doctoral disseration, The Ohio State University, 1988.)

Yinger, R. J. A study of teacher planning: Description and theory development using ethnographic and information processing methods. (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1977.)

Zahorik, J. A teachers' planning models. Educational Leadership, 1975, 33, 134-139.

Zais, R. S. Curriculum. New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1976.

Zeichner, K. M. and Tabachnick, B. R. The development of teacher perspectives: Social strategies and institutional control in the socialization of beginning teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 1985, 2, 1-25.

Zumwalt, K. K. Working together to improve teaching. In Zumwalt, K. K., ed. Improving teaching. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1986.